

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May 2, 2007.

Claims 1-67 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-67.

The present Response amends claims 1, 22, 23, 24, 34, 39, 40, 41, 50 and 67, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-67. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

The disclosure is objected to because of a summary is not present in the disclosure. A Brief Summary of the Invention has been added.

Applicant has been advised that should claims 2, 3 and 4 be found allowable, claims 22, 23, 24, 39, 40 and 41 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. To avoid this problem, claims 22 – 24 have been made dependent on claim 1; claims 39-41 have been made dependent on claim 34.

Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 67 has been changed into a computer readable storage medium claim.

Claims 1, 34, 50 and 67 recite the limitation “the representation” which does not have an antecedent basis. Claims 1, 34, 50 and 67 have been amended to avoid this antecedent basis problem.

Claims 1-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shiigi et al. (US 2003/0014442 A1).

Independent claims 1, 18, 34, 50 and 67 include the limitation “Wherein each one of the controls has an entitlement that can be used to determine whether or not the control is visible when rendered”. Such an entitlement is not shown in Shiigi. Shiigi uses text and tags, but there is no suggestion that such text or tags is used to determine whether a control is visible when rendered.

Independent claims 1, 50 and 67 have the further limitation that “one of the set of controls can communicate with another of the set of controls”. This is not shown in Shiigi. Shiigi shows object reuse, but this is not the same as communication between controls.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 26, 2007

By: /Joseph P. O'Malley/
Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800